REMARKS

The objection to claim 3 is attended to above with the reference character deletion requested that does not affect the scope of the claim.

Original claims 1 and 5 and 7, 8 and 12 are combined and edited without narrowing or, therefore, Festo-like limitations even if in response to a statutory rejection despite some thinking to the contrary. Claim 21 is also combined with claim 12.

This traversed the rejection under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by the cited Cobben patent, because every element claimed must be present in the patent to maintain the rejection. Claim 1 now requires viewing non-perpendicularly perpendicular perforations for deriving authenticity. As shown in Figs. 8 and 9 of the Cobben patent, for example, and described at col. 4, lines 1-14 and 25-29, it requires viewing non-perpendicularly non-perpendicular perforations for deriving authenticity, wherefore the claimed deriving is different.

It is true that the Cobben, et al. patent discloses some perforations having elongate cross sections, but for verification these extend non-perpendicularly through a carrier. The claimed method teaches verification of documents having perpendicular perforations with elongate cross sections. Therefore, the method is based on the fact that when such an elongate hole is viewed under an oblique angle, the transmission will depend on how the long and short axes of the perforation are arranged in respect to the viewer as illustrated in Figs. 3 an 4 of the present application.

In contrast to this, the only instance where Cobben, et al. teach to view the document under an oblique angle is for a document that has holes extending obliquely therethrough. Therefore, the Cobben , et al. method is based on the fact that when such an oblique hole is

viewed under an oblique angle, the transmission will depend on how the axis of the hole is arranged in respect to the viewer.

In other words, the basic principles of the claim 1 and the patent are different. Such change of basic principles proves that the person skilled in the art would not modify the embodiments of the patent for the method claimed. See, *MPEP* 2143.01 VI.

The rejections of claims 7 and 21 under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by the Cobben, et al. patent are traversed at least by the combination of perforations through the carrier with equal-area cross sections. The Action finds equal area cross sections at col. 3, line 65, to col. 4, line 3, of the Cobben, et al. patent. However, these lines refer to "... perforations 2 [that] do not extend through the whole thickness of the document ...," col. 3, lines 62-63, i.e., blind holes, and not through perforations, as claimed.

In the patent, the security feature depends on the brightness of the blind holes when viewing the document against a light source, which depends on how deep the blind holes are, and which does not make any sense when the holes extend through the document, as claimed. Therefore, these claims are not obvious from the patent, either.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930